

# Bryn Mawr Classical Review

Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2000.02.40

---

**Peter M. Fraser and Elaine Matthews (edd.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Vol. III.A. The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily, and Magna Graecia.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Pp. xxxii, 519. ISBN 0-19-815229-9. \$150.**

---

**Reviewed by R.W.B. Salway, University College London ([ucrarws@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:ucrarws@ucl.ac.uk))**

Word count: 3995 words

With the publication of this volume, a decade after the appearance of the first, which covered the Aegean islands, Cyprus and Cyrenaica, the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (hereafter LGPN) project has reached the half-way mark in its plan to provide a repertorium of the onomastic canon of the Hellenic oikoumene of the archaic and classical periods. Areas central to the Hellenophone world of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, namely inland Anatolia, Syria, Palestine and Egypt, have been explicitly left aside for a second series. Although the Lexicon project has always anticipated and hoped to meet the needs of a wide range of users, the interest of its founder, Peter Fraser, in the question of detecting ethnic patterns in the popularity of certain names that might confirm or confound the establishment of links between Greek colonies and their claimed mother cities, has left an undeniable impression on the overall structure of the Lexicon (on which more below). Even before the appearance of the present volume, the LGPN had already proved itself to be an established and indispensable part of the armoury of research tools available to both philologists and historians. The latter group awaited the second volume, covering Attica, with particular anticipation, since it effectively provided an updated *Prosopographica Attica*. This exemplifies the particular strength of LGPN; that is, the way in which it unites data from the literary tradition with the epigraphic material, which, given the aggravating lacunae in the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, is so much more daunting for the individual scholar to tackle than for his/her counterpart working on Latin material. Indeed, as regards recorded individuals, the Lexicon provides a consolidated and comprehensive survey of a kind that, for some areas, has not been available since the indices of the now antiquated *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*; as such the LGPN is an enormous boon to a wide range of potential users.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, the printed volumes of the LGPN now represent just one strand of the project because a complementary electronic database is being compiled which allows researchers to analyze the data in yet more ways and facilitates the production of statistics (for details see the LGPN website: <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/>). Thus I can report that volume III.A contains 11,032 different names, representing 43,261 individual persons. Refining these figures further, from my own calculations I can report that across the whole of volume III.A the vast majority of names are attested as borne by thirty

individuals or less, while only 197 names (c. 1.75 %) are borne by over thirty, the top ten being: Nikias (139), Nikandros (142), Kallikrates (150), Herakleidas (155), Apollonios (168), Leon (176), Philon (182), Ariston (197), Philippos (198), Alexandros (234), and Dionysios (313).<sup>2</sup> The pre-eminence of the always popular theophoric Dionysios is no surprise, being the most frequent name in both volume I (608 out of 66,489) and volume II (1,103 out of 62,361 individuals). It is curious however, given the fame of the tyrant of Syracuse, that volume III.A should exhibit the lowest number of Dionysioi proportionally. The second and third places gained by the names of the two over-achieving Macedonians does seem to mark a regional variation, however, since in volumes I and II these were consistently out-performed by Demetrios and Apollonios. The popularity of an already existing Greek name in the wake of the fame of a particular individual is in contrast with the resistance of naming habits to novelties, however highly endorsed. Thus the 'cognominate form' of Diocles, perhaps coined by the emperor Diocletianus himself, is borne by only one other person in LGPN, and then only as a second name.<sup>3</sup> More generally, the popularity of Zopyros and Lykiskos (with 106 and 104 examples respectively) came as surprises to me, emphasising the importance of the LGPN volumes as controls on the impressions gained from the milieu of classical literature and Egyptian papyri. The best attested female name lags along way behind the males; Elpis and Tyche share the honour with 62 each, both strongly suggestive of servile origin or ancestry. As for regional oddities, the large number and narrow distribution of Boiskos (48 persons, almost exclusively in Epirus) is notable (pp. 92-93).

In all major respects the printed volume III.A continues the pattern of volume II, including the provision of the reverse index of names, so vociferously demanded by reviewers of the first volume. The lexico-geographical organisation of the material is continued, whereby each lemma represents a different name, each instance of which is separately listed according to location, numbered, and given a date. An additional feature of the electronic database is that the entries are assigned genders, so that one can say that of the 43,261 persons, 36,848 are men, 6,335 are women, and 78 unknown, represented by 8,424 male, 2,630 female, and 49 ambiguous names. So while the proportion of men to women attested is 6:1, that of male to female names is nearer 4:1, which may demonstrate a proportionally broader canon of names for women, for whatever reason. Besides gender, sporadic data on persons' status/occupations (e.g. prytanis, freedman), which is of great value to sociological research, is buried within the entries but can now be interrogated by submitting a search request to the LGPN team. Nevertheless, I feel that an opportunity for much more categorization, even if crude, has been lost. Despite the misgivings of some past reviewers, the distinction between dialectical (rather than orthographic) variants is, I think, usefully maintained; accordingly, no less than fifty-five different names beginning with Wau (as 'digamma' ought properly to be called) are duly listed between Epsilon and Zeta (pp. 185-86). The distinction between the two forms of variant is obviously not always clear and some cases seem to have received inconsistent treatment; e.g. why, given the orthography of the inscription cited, is Theodoros 136 (p. 203) not under the lemma 'Theudoros' (p. 208)? It is to be regretted that these dialectical variants still lack cross-referencing to associated forms, a deficiency that will be rectified in LGPN III.B.

Within the lemmata, the location categories are also organised alphabetically, rather than by geographical contiguity, with the partial exception of Magna Graecia where the material is kept together under the general heading 'S. Italy', before being further

alphabetically organised under Apulia, Bruttium, Calabria, etc. Islands of any significant size are treated as separate entities rather than grouped together (e.g. as Ionian) or associated with mainland regions. Thus, as the editors point out (p. ix), material from Leukas is found separately listed, despite its strong historical connection with mainland Acarnania (including acting as head of the league), with which, save for a channel of a few hundred yards' width, it would actually be physically joined. In accordance with the editors' interest in the ethnico-geographical origins of names, the principle of 'repatriation' is continued; that is, if an individual is recorded only in place x but as originating from place y, (s)he appears in LGPN under place y. Thus the philosopher Pythagoras son of Mnesarchos is not to be found anywhere in Magna Graecia because he has been duly listed on Samos (LGPN II, p. 391 Pythagoras 20). Those without attested provenance but with a close association with a particular locale (which in this volume is true for many freedman at Pompeii) are asterisked. Those homeless persons remaining will be collected together in volume VI. It has been a slightly frustrating (and surprising, given Fraser's original interests) aspect of the printed volumes that they have no index of locations, making the compilation of canons of names for regions or individual cities a laborious process. However, this information is now retrievable from the electronic database. For example, one can now say that between the volume's four broad regional divisions, the distribution of persons, largely reflecting that of epigraphy, is: Peloponnese 22,205; Western Greece 7,305; Sicily 5252; and Magna Graecia 8498.<sup>4</sup>

The geographical parameters of volume III.A require some explanation. As originally advertised (LGPN I, p. vii), LGPN III was to cover, in addition to those areas now comprised in III.A, 'the Greek mainland as far as, and including Thessaly; ... Western Europe; N. Africa, etc.' The daunting bulk of the volume led to a decision to divide it into two approximately equal parts, 'representing recognizable historical and linguistic areas' (LGPN III.A, p. vii). Volume III.B is now advertised as covering 'Central Greece, Boeotia, Thessaly', while 'miscellaneous Western Mediterranean sites' (presumably such as Antipolis, Nicaea, Massilia, etc.) have been relegated to volume IV along with Macedonia, Thrace and the Black Sea. Thus the more comprehensive coverage of the western Mediterranean seems to have been tacitly abandoned. The geographical limits of volume III.A in this direction are described in the introduction (pp. viii-x). The decision to include the Adriatic and Magna Graecia in the same volume as the Peloponnese reflects the desire to link Corinth and the Achaean cities with their putative colonies. On the Tyrrhenian shore coverage of the Italian peninsula is terminated, in a move reminiscent of the post-war divisions of Korea and Vietnam, at the forty-first parallel, which conveniently includes Neapolis, Puteoli and Misenum but excludes less hellenized centres such as Capua. Although need for the inclusion of Rome is rendered unnecessary by the comprehensiveness of Heikki Solin's *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: ein Namenbuch* (CIL Auctarium: Berlin-New York 1982), the awkward gap between Puteoli and Rome is irksome. Across the Apennines, coverage of Italy's eastern shore expires further north, at approximately Rome's latitude, with the Gargano peninsula. As for the spine in between, it is vaguely stated that the Samnite hinterland is omitted. Although empirical sampling of the volume's contents does reveal the exact limits of its coverage of southern Italy, a more precisely worded description or even a map might have been helpful. On the eastern shore of the Adriatic LGPN III.A takes in Dalmatia up to Tragourion (mod. Trogir in Croatia), corresponding approximately to the latitude of Ancona, which might thus have formed a neater northern limit for the Italian Adriatic littoral. It seems that coverage in Dalmatia really is restricted to the coastline, so, for

example, the marine auxiliary centurion Plator of the Mazaei (a tribe of Salonae's hinterland), who received the diploma CIL XVI 14 (dated 5 April AD 71), and his father Venetus are ignored, although they would be in good company in LGPN III.A (cf. Plator 1-28, pp. 363-64, and Benetos 1-2, p. 90).

LGPN's criteria for inclusion and exclusion of names have largely remained unchanged for volume III.A. In linguistic terms a 'Greek name' is defined as one of any etymology recorded in the Greek alphabet but as excluding Greek names recorded in non-Greek scripts, with the exception of the Cypriot syllabary and -- of considerable consequence for this volume -- Latin. The upper chronological limit is essentially determined in any particular place by the emergence of a historically reliable epigraphic and/or literary record, so excluding Mycenaean, epic and mythological names. The lower chronological limit is more arbitrary, being fixed at c. AD 600+ for the entirety of volumes I and II. Whatever the deficiencies in the fulfilment of this aim, at least it was consistent.<sup>5</sup> The biggest problem with III.A is that this clear cut-off has been replaced by a vaguely expressed statement in relation to Italy and Sicily that 'to have kept to our usual later limit of the mid-seventh century A.D. would have been to stray into the new world that followed the barbarian inroads into Italy and Sicily, ...' (p. x). Combined with the original decision to investigate the Latin literary sources with less diligence and generally to ignore any Latin writer after the fourth century (LGPN I, p. ix), the reliability of any survey based on LGPN's data from c. AD 400-600+ becomes extremely questionable. As a consequence the significance of the material that is systematically included, such as the fourth- to sixth-century catacomb texts from Catana (mod. Catania) and Syracuse, may be distorted. The result of these editorial decisions is the presentation of a set of data that is not consistent within the same volume (Dalmatia and the Peloponnese presumably being more thoroughly covered up to at least AD 600) and is not comparable for these later centuries with the other volumes in the series. Given the origin of the project this decision is understandable but it is, nevertheless, regrettable, since it unnecessarily prejudices the issue of what qualifies as a 'Greek name' and, even if a judgement is made to privilege those deemed 'classical', it vitiates the utility of LGPN as a scientific tool for measuring the stages of the replacement of that system of personal naming with the Christian/Byzantine one. The patchiness of the coverage of later material is immediately noticeable from a glance at the entry for Kosmas (p. 255, col. iii), which one would expect to be quite numerous but exhibits only three instances (cf. Sergios p. 392, col. ii.: 3 examples), and that for Menas (p. 299, col. ii) with only 7 examples, of which the only south Italian examples are supposedly early imperial. A random sampling of Ch. and L. Pietri's *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, 2. Italie (313-604), I. A-K (Rome 1999) is enough to give some impression of the extent of lacunae in LGPN III.A in this respect, where the papal letters, especially those of Gregory the Great, are a rich source of southern Italians with Greek names, e.g. the two Dionysii of Vibo Valentia (Hipponion) who stirred up trouble there in AD 492/96 (Gelasius, Ep. 39.2-3) and whose inclusion would have doubled the number attested there (Dionysios 215 & 216, p. 130).

With an eye to facilitating research into patterns of name-giving within families, LGPN records family relationships where known, though only vertically (father, son, mother, daughter) and not horizontally (e.g. brother, sister); this is unfortunate since sometimes these relationships are known in the absence of attestation of parentage (on which see further below). From an onomastic point of view my favourite pair of alternating names

from father to son is without question Leon and Antileon, a pattern witnessed in both Aetolia and Lucania (see Antileon 7. & 13, p. 45). However, the one set of abbreviations that I found gave me any difficulty were precisely those for family relationships. Although d., f., m., and s. are resolved in the key (p. xxxii) as daughter, father, mother, son, their use in the context of the entries with a name in the nominative in fact requires the resolution 'father of' etc. I find the use of 'f. + nom.' to mean 'father of' to be somewhat counter-intuitive, since it naturally invites the resolution 'father = x', the opposite of what the editors intended. Although this is only a minor irritation, I feel that the adoption of the style 'f. of' would have greatly aided clarity. The layout of entries and of typesetting is otherwise generally extremely clear. In terms of production the three-column format of the previous two volumes has been retained but, on the aesthetic front, I welcome the abandonment of the rather aggressive font employed for the lemmata in LGPN II. Instead volume III.A has reverted to the Porson monotype familiar from Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon, which I personally find easier on the eye. A small gripe is that, in order to divide the text tidily into columns, the spacing between lemmata has occasionally been squeezed in the third column to the detriment of clarity.<sup>6</sup>

Spotting omissions and inconsistencies in a work such as LGPN is a favourite sport of reviewers from which I shall largely refrain. However, one high-profile 'missing person' offers a salutary lesson as to the danger of ignoring the later Latin literature; that is, the case of Eleuther bishop of Rome c. AD 174-89. He is duly recorded in Solin's *Griech. Personennamen in Rom* (vol. II, p. 842). Nevertheless the account of his origin from the *Liber Pontificalis* means that according to the principles of LGPN he ought to be repatriated to Nicopolis in Epirus and take his rightful place alongside the four other Eleutheroi of LGPN III.A (p. 140): 'Eleuther, natione Grecus, ex patre {H}Abundio, de oppido Nicopoli, sedit ann. XV m. III d. II.' (LP 14.1).<sup>7</sup> If known to the compilers of LGPN, it seems unfortunate to have excluded Eleuther(os) because attested in a source of later than AD 400 or because deemed to be of dubious historicity (martyrological sources are deliberately avoided for this reason) since far more dubious names are included, with or without the qualification 'fict(itious)' (on which more below). The editors of LGPN have continued their policy of always giving each entry a date, even if necessarily vague, so allowing the electronic database to be sorted chronologically. Nevertheless a clear-cut case of inconsistency concerns Eupra[ktos] o kai Diokletianos of IG XIV 110 from Syracuse who is dated in the catch-all category 'byz.' under Eupraktos 3 (p. 173) but 'iii-v AD' under Diokletianos 1 (p. 128).

As acknowledged by Peter Fraser in the preface to LGPN I (p. viii), a far more serious problem is that of 'ghost-names'. There he had in mind chiefly the problem of those created by the erroneous expansion of fragmentary inscriptions. The practice of LGPN, which largely eschews expanding fragmentary names, has eliminated such ghosts but it seems that literary evidence has been less rigorously vetted. Several problem cases arise from the prosopographical catalogue of followers of Pythagoras appended to the *de vita Pythagorica* by the late third-century AD Neoplatonist Iamblichus of Syrian Chalcis (though this section is thought to derive from the lost *Life of Pythagoras* by Aristoxenus of Tarentum, born c. 370 BC). The catalogue comprises 218 men and seventeen women, which, given the concentration of Pythagorean activity in Magna Graecia, is obviously a source of great significance for LGPN III.A. However, it needs to be treated with care because the modern text of the *de vita Pythagorica* relies on a single fourteenth-century minuscule manuscript in Florence, of which the standard edition is the Teubner by

Ludwig Deubner.<sup>8</sup> The LGPN entry for Aresandros 1 (p. 53) exhibits exemplary care; the name derives from a conjecture of August Nauck, who identified the Aresas of Lucania who appears in the main text (VP 266) with the Lucanian Oresandros listed in the catalogue of Pythagoreans (VP 267), all of which is signalled in the entry.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless it is regrettable that there are no entries at all -- not even for the purpose of cross-reference to Aresandros -- under Aresas or Oresandros, the two forms actually attested. Further problems arise with fellow Lucanians Okkelos, Okkilos (p. 339) and their supposed sisters Okkelo and Ekkelo (pp. 138, 339), not least because the lack of indication of horizontal familial links makes their interrelationships at best opaque to the user of LGPN and at worst impossible to discern; neither does their common adherence to the Pythagorean school belong to a category of status/occupation noted in LGPN. Investigating the sources, one finds that in the catalogue of male Pythagoreans Iamblichus certainly registers Okkelos and Okkilos as Lucanians and brothers (VP 267). A surviving work *On the Nature of the Universe* of c. 200/150 BC was pseudonymously attributed to Okkelos and a similarly spurious work *On Justice* may be attributed to Ekkelos by Stobaeus.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, it seems highly probable that the two brothers were accidentally created by a mistaken identification of Okkilos/Ekkelos as separate individuals rather than simply the result of variant transliterations of a non-Hellenic name into Greek.<sup>11</sup> In contrast, it is solely on the basis of the final section of Iamblichus' text -- his list of 'the most famous Pythagorean women' (VP 267) -- that LGPN records his/their sisters. The most immediate problem with this section is that, while the text claims a total of seventeen Pythagorean women, as it stands it names only sixteen. The problematic section lies at the beginning of the list, where the manuscript reads: Πυθαγορίδες δὲ γυναῖκες αἱ ἐπιφανέσταται· Τιμύχα γυνὴ ἡ Μυλλία τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, Φιλτύς θυγάτηρ Θεόφριος τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, Βυνδάκου ἀδελφῆ Ὀκκέλω καὶ Ἐκκέλω τῶν Λευκανῶν, Χείλωνις θυγάτηρ Χείλωνος τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου etc. It is undoubtedly the case that the medieval scribe had considerable difficulty with this list of very unfamiliar names.<sup>12</sup> To render some sense of this Hermann Diels favoured emending the recorded total from seventeen to sixteen, while Deubner adopted a more radical tactic: discerning a punctuation mark after Βυνδάκου ἀδελφῆ, he suggested understanding Byndakou as a masculine genitive rather than feminine nominative, construing the section as 'Filtys daughter of Theophris of Croton, sister of Byndakos'.<sup>13</sup> This has the consequence of further reducing the total of Pythagorean women to fifteen. Thus, following a suggestion of Scaliger, Deubner proposed that the scribe had confounded original Doric genitives of the brothers Okkelos and Ekkelos with nominatives of similarly named sisters -- Okkelo and Ekkelo -- omitting the latter pair through haplography; hence the text of the Teubner edition: Πυθαγορίδες δὲ γυναῖκες αἱ ἐπιφανέσταται· Τιμύχα γυνὴ {ἡ} Μυλλία τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, Φιλτύς θυγάτηρ Θεόφριος τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου Βυνδάκου ἀδελφῆ, Ὀκκελῶ καὶ Ἐκκελῶ <ἀδελφαὶ Ὀκκέλω καὶ Ἐκκέλω> τῶν Λευκανῶν, Χείλωνις θυγάτηρ Χείλωνος τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου etc., followed in the translation by John Dillon and Jackson Hershbell, 'The most famous Pythagorean women are: Timycha, wife of Myllias of Croton, Philtys, daughter of Theophris of Croton, sister of Byndakos, Occelo and Eccelo, sisters of the Lucanians Occelus and Occilus, Cheilonis, daughter of Cheilon the Lacedaimonian.'<sup>14</sup> Excluding the Pythagorean men Myllias of Croton and Chilon of Sparta and his daughter, attested elsewhere in Iamblichus' text and beyond, it is solely upon the authority of this passage that LGPN III.A registers the females Timycha (p. 433), Filtys (p. 462), Okkelo, Ekkelo, and the males Theophris (p. 207) and Byndakos (p. 95). Most alarmingly then, the

apparently well-founded LGPN entries for Ekkelo and Okkelo, prove to be founded on no more than an interpolated doublet of a pair of names which might themselves even be a doublet.

Aside from the interpolated sisters, the most unsatisfactory part of Deubner's solution is the encumbering of Philtys with two defining relationships, whereas in the rest of the list a single one is standard (father or husband). Given the supposed fame of Philtys and the other women Pythagoreans listed here, it is tempting to identify her with the Pythagorean Phintys daughter of Kallikrates, to whom five extracts of a work *On the Conduct of a Woman* are attributed by Stobaeus.<sup>15</sup> This slight emendation, which also necessitates the insertion of her father's name, suggests the presence of a lacuna before Theophris in which the name of the missing Pythagorean woman may have been lost. Moreover the need to make 'Byndakou' a brother of 'Philtys' and to interpolate the Lucanian sisters is removed. This list might thus have read: Φιντύς θυγάτηρ <Καλλικράτους τοῦ ... [name] θυγάτηρ> Θεόφριος τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου, Βυνδάκω ἀδελφῆ Ὀκκέλου καὶ Ἐκκέλου τῶν Λευκανῶν. Such a solution would result in the deletion of not only the Lucanian sisters but also LGPN III.A's Philtys of Croton, dissolving the supposed familial links between 'Phintys', Theophris, and 'Byndakos', and would transform the latter from a man of Croton into a woman, Byndako, sister of the Lucanians Okkelos and Okkilos/Ekkelos. Whatever the truth about Byndakos' gender, the editors of LGPN might have been wise to put him/her in their 'ambiguous' category. The overall moral would seem to be that, for cases such as Okkelo and Ekkelo, they might also be wise to allow themselves the option of marking an individual/name as 'inc(ertus/a)'.

My concentration on these points of detail should not be taken to indicate dissatisfaction with the volume overall. With the exception of a need to be more explicit and consistent about the limits of the published data-set and to be as critical of the literary as of the epigraphic evidence, my reservations are all very minor. The advantages of having the LGPN far outweigh its minor drawbacks and, indeed, the LGPN continues to become ever more useful as it develops and grows. In short, it ought now to be an essential feature of any serious research library for classical philology and related fields.

---

#### Notes:

1. As demonstrated by the range of papers delivered at the colloquium entitled 'Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence', organised by the project and held at the British Academy on Friday 11 July 1998.

2. I list here the full results (with simplified transliteration). Over 30: Abaskantos, Agathe, Agathopous, Aleximachos, Alexion, Alkimos, Andreas, Anthos, Aniketos, Anteros, Antigonos, Apollonidas, Aristeidias, Aristeus, Aristippos, Aristophanes, Archedamos, Archelaos, Archippos, Asklepiadas, Asklepiades, Attikos, Gaios, Glaukias, Glaukos, Gorgos, Damarchos, Damokritos, Damonikos, Damosthenes, Deinias, Deinon, Diophantos, Epagathos, Epaphras, hErmogenes, Eudamidas, Euodos, Euporos, Zenon, hErakleitos, Theotimos, Thrason, hIpparchos, Kallimachos, Kallisthenes, Kallistos, Kleomachos, Kleonumos, Leonidas, Lukinos, Lukophron, Luson, Markos, Mousa, Murtilos, Narkissos, Neon, Nikarchos, Olumpis, Pamphilos, Poluxenos, Pratonikos, Purros, Sopatros, Sosipatros, Sosippos, Soteridas, Timokles, Trophimos, hYginos,

Phalakrion, Phalakros, Phileros, Philistos, Phoibos, Charixenos; over 40: Agias, Aischulos, Antipatros, Aristoteles, Artemon, Archias, Atimetos, Aphrodisia, Boiskos, Dameas, Epikrates, Theodotos, Theophilos, Theon, Kallippos, Lukon, Lusimachos, Lusippos, Menekrates, Nikokles, Nikokrates, Nikolaos, Numphodoros, Xenokles, Onasimos, Onesiphoros, Pausanias, Polemarchos, Polukratos, Simos; over 50: Aischrion, Andron, Aphrodisios, Damokles, Diodoros, Eukleidas, Euthuchia, Zosime, hleron, Kerdon, Kleandros, Nike, Timon, Philista, Philodamos, Philostratos, Philotas; over 60: Aristreas, Aristion, Aristomenes, Artemidoros, Damon, Diokles, Dion, Elpis, hllaros, Kallistratos, Lusantias, Saturos, Sosandros, Soterichos, Sotion, Tuche, Philistion; over 70: Aristomachos, Damokrates, Euthuches, Kallias, Nikephoros, Onesimos, Stephanos, Straton, Sosikrates, Sostratos, Philokles; over 80: Agathon, Andronikos, Aristarchos, Damatrios, Demetrios, Diogenes, Eros, Menandros, Nikomachos, Sokrates, Timokrates, Philokrates, Philonidas,; over 90: Antiochos, Apollodoros, Epaphroditos, hErmes, Eudamos, Kleon, Nikostratos; over 100: Aristokles, Zoilos, Zopuros, Lukiskos, Lukos, Xenon, Philoxenos; over 110: Aristokrates, Zosimos, Nikanor; over 120: Agathokles, Aristodamos, Nikon; over 130: Euthuchos, Theodoros, Nikias; over 140: Kallikrates, Nikandros; over 150: hErakleidas; over 160: Apollonios; over 170: Leon; over 180: Philon; over 190: Ariston, Philippos; over 230: Alexandros; over 310: Dionusios.

3. Εὔπρα[κτος] ὁ καὶ Διοκλητιανός of IG XIV 110 from Syracuse (p. 128).

4. Peloponnese: general 171; Achaia 1,221; Aigina 597; Aitolia 1,629; Akarnania 1,172; Argolis 4,577; Arkadia 3,414; Elis 1,019; Korinthia 2,013; Kynouria 19; Lakonia 4,788; Messenia 1,510; Triphylia 75. Western Greece: Dalmatia 566, Epiros 3,330; Illyria 2,302; Ithake 101; Kephallenia 213; Kerkyra 447; Leukas 307; Zakynthos 49. Sicily: 5,252. Magna Graecia: general 123; Apulia-Calabria 1,737; Bruttium-Lucania 1,884; Campania 4,754. Figures compiled and corrected from <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/>.

5. For deficiencies see H. Solin reviewing M.J. Osborne and S.G. Byrne (edd.), *LGPN II. Attica* (Oxford 1994) in *Arctos* 29 (1995), 197.

6. e.g. on pp. 66, 92, 94, 134, 144, 247, 408.

7. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis I* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 2e série: Paris 1886), p. 136. The description of Eleuther as 'natione Graecus' surely indicates that the Nicopolis in question is the Nicopolis on the Ambraciot Gulf near Actium, rather than Nicopolis ad Nestum in Thrace or Nicopolis ad Istrum in Moesia.

8. Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana, pluteus 86, codex 3. L. Deubner (ed.), *Iamblichi de vita Pythagorica* (Leipzig 1937), rev. ed. U. Klein (Stuttgart 1975).

9. A. Nauck (ed.), *Iamblichi de vita Pythagorica liber ad fidem codicis Florentini* (St. Petersburg 1884).

10. For the fragments of the περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως of Okkelos see H. Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th rev. ed. W. Kranz (Berlin 1951-52) pp. 440-41 = S. Hornblower & A. Spawforth (edd.), *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. (Oxford 1996), 1058, 'Ocellus'. Pseudonymous περὶ δικαιοσύνης attributed to Ekkelos [ms. 'Εκπώλου] by Stobaeus, *Anth.* I p. 196 (peri dik. No 54).

11. H. Thesleff, 'Okkelos, Archytas, and Plato', *Eranos* 60 (1962), 8-36, esp. 10.

12. Later in the list the scribe was so unsure of the word division that he produced the nonsensical Πεισιρρόδη Ταραντίς Νισθεάδουσα Λάκαινα in place of the intelligible Πεισιρρόδη Ταραντινίς Θεάδουσα Λάκαινα.

13. Diels, *FVS*, 6th ed., p 448. Although not revealed in his apparatus, Deubner explained his rationale in his 'Bemerkungen zum Text der Vita Pythagorae des



Iamblichos', *Sitzungsbericht der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse* 19 (1935), 686-87.

14. J. Dillon & J. Hershbell, *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Way of Life* (Texts and Translations 29, Graeco-Roman Religion Series 11; Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta, GA 1991), 259. In contrast Gillian Clark, *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Life* (Translated Texts for Historians 8: Liverpool 1989), 113, omits the brothers, rendering 'Philtys daughter of Theophris of Kroton and sister of Byndakos, the sisters Okkelo and Ekkelo from Leukania'.

15. Stobaeus, *Anth.* III pp. 63-70 (gamika parangelmata 61-65); RE XX.1, cols. 250-51.

[Read  
Latest](#)

[Index for  
2000](#)

[Change Greek  
Display](#)

[Archives](#)

[Books Available for  
Review](#)

[BMCR  
Home](#)

HTML generated at 13:26:42, Friday, 03 April 2009